REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-10, 12-17, and 19-24 were pending in this application. Claims 2, 5-10, 13, 15-17, and 19-24 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 12, and 24 are independent. The remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 12.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 3, 12, 14, and 24 have been amended to clarify the invention. Support for the aforementioned amendments may be found, for example, in Figures 1, 3, 4, 7, and 8 as well as in paragraphs [0052]-[0059]. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned amendments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6 and 10

Claims 1-4, 6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,493837 ("Pang") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,511,190 ("Sharma"). Claims 2, 6, and 10 have been cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. With respect to the remaining claims, for the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited prior art must include each element claimed. *See* MPEP § 2143(A)(1). Turning to the rejection, the independent claims have been amended to clarify that: (i) each processor obtains data while execution probes in the kernel; (ii) the data is stored in a data set, where the data set includes an aggregation identifier that identifies the aggregation and intermediate results generated by applying the aggregation function to at least a portion of the data obtained by each processor; (iii) obtaining an aggregation result for the entire kernel by applying the aggregation function to the intermediate results; and (iv) the intermediate results are stored in per-processor kernel-level buffers and the aggregation result is stored in a user-level buffer.

Turning to the rejection, none of the cited prior art teaches or suggests all of the aforementioned limitations. Specifically, the Examiner admits that Pang does not teach or suggest aggregating data. *See* Office Action mailed September 10, 2007, p. 4. Further, Sharma fails to teach or suggest that which Pang lacks. Specifically, Sharma does not teach or suggest: (i) aggregation of data on a per-processor basis to obtain intermediate results, (ii) storing intermediate results in kernel-level buffers; (iii) storing aggregation identifiers with the intermediate results; and (iv) aggregating data in a user-level buffer.

In view of the above, the amended independent the pending claims are patentable over Pang and Sharma. Pending dependent claims are patentable over Pang and Sharma for at least the same reasons as the aforementioned amended independent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15, 20, and 24

Claims 5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Pang in view of Sharma and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,578,131 ("Larson"). Claims 5, 7-9, 13, 15 and 20 have been cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. With respect to the remaining claims, for the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Pang and Sharma fail to teach or suggest all the elements of the amended independent claims. Further, Larson fails to teach or suggest that which Pang and Sharma lack as evidenced by the fact that Larson is only relied upon to teach concepts related to hashing. *See* Office Action mailed September 10, 2007, pp. 11-15.

In view of the above, the amended independent the pending claims are patentable over Pang, Sharma, and Larson. Pending dependent claims are patentable over Pang, Sharma, and Larson for at least the same reasons as the aforementioned amended independent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 19, and 20-23

Claims 14, 19, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Pang in view of Sharma and Larson, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0159132 ("Barnett"). Claims 19-23 have been cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. With respect to the remaining claims, for the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Pang, Sharma, and Larson fail to teach or suggest all the elements of the amended independent claims claims. Further, Barnett fails to teach or suggest that which Pang, Sharma, and Larson lack as evidenced by the fact that Barnett is only relied upon to teach concepts related to data dictionaries. *See* Office Action mailed September 10, 2007, pp. 16-17.

In view of the above, the amended independent the pending claims are patentable over Pang, Sharma, Larson, and Barnett. Pending dependent claims are patentable over Pang, Sharma, Larson, and Barnett for at least the same reasons as the aforementioned amended independent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/330001SUN040156).

Dated: December 10, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

By__/Robert P. Lord/_____
    Robert P. Lord
    Registration No.: 46,479
    OSHA · LIANG LLP
    1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
    Houston, Texas 77010
    (713) 228-8600
    (713) 228-8778 (Fax)
    Attorney for Applicant